

Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ): 32-item checklist

Submission to CMAJ Open

Title: Mind the gap: perceptions and experiences of a gender gap at a Canadian research institute and potential strategies to mitigate this gap, a mixed methods study.

Authors: Mascarenhas A, Moore JE, Tricco A, Hamid J, Daly C, Bain J, Jassemi S, Kiran T, Baxter N, and Straus S.

No. Item	Guide questions/description	Response
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity		
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>		
1. Interviewer/facilitator	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	Alekhya Mascarenhas, Sabrina Jassemi, and Julie Bain; stated in text (methods)
2. Credentials	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	Alekhya Mascarenhas, MPH, Research Coordinator, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital
3. Occupation	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	<p>Julia E. Moore, PhD, MSc, Research Program Manager, St. Michael's Hospital</p> <p>Andrea C. Tricco, PhD Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute,, MSc, Scientist, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital</p> <p>Jemila Hamid, PhD, MSc, Scientist, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, McMaster University</p> <p>Caitlin Daly, MSc, Graduate, St. Michael's Hospital, Julie Bain, BSc, Research Assistant, Li Ka Shing</p>

		<p>Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital</p> <p>Sabrina Jassemi, BSc, Research Assistant, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital</p> <p>Tara Kiran, MD, MSc, Associate Scientist, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto</p> <p>Nancy Baxter, MD, PhD, Scientist, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto</p> <p>Sharon E. Straus, MD, MSc, Director, Knowledge Translation Program, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital</p>
4. Gender	Was the researcher male or female?	All researchers were female
5. Experience and training	What experience or training did the researcher have?	<p>Dr. Sharon Straus is a principal investigator for numerous qualitative and quantitative studies. Jemila Hamid and Caitlin Daly are experienced biostatisticians. Alekhya Mascarenhas is a highly skilled qualitative analyst. She oversaw the research assistants (Julie Bain and Sabrina Jassemi) who have been trained in qualitative data collection. The remaining authors are all researchers in their own right – both in quantitative and qualitative research. They provided input on the manuscript and final reports from this research study. With the exception of Tara Kiran and Nancy Baxter, all the authors are a part of the Knowledge Translation Program of which Dr. Sharon Straus is the director.</p>

<i>Relationship with participants</i>		
6. Relationship established	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	There was no relationship established prior to study commencement.
7. Participant knowledge of the interviewer	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Participants knew that the intent of the research was to explore experiences and perceptions of the gender gap at their research institution.
8. Interviewer characteristics	What characteristics were reported about the inter viewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	There were no characteristics reported about the interviewers.
Domain 2: study design		
<i>Theoretical framework</i>		
9. Methodological orientation and Theory	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	This was a sequential mixed methods study. Phase 1 was a descriptive analysis of quantitative data. Phase 2 was a thematic analysis of qualitative interviews; stated in text (methods)
<i>Participant selection</i>		
10. Sampling	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	Purposive and snowball sampling; stated in text (methods)
11. Method of approach	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	Participants received a personalized email invitation letter; stated in text (methods)
12. Sample size	How many participants were in the study?	Twenty-one participants
13. Non-participation	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	We are not aware of any individuals that refused to participate in the study. No participants dropped
<i>Setting</i>		
14. Setting of data collection	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	Telephone interviews in private meeting rooms in the Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute at St. Michael's Hospital.
15. Presence of non-participants	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	No

16. Description of sample	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	Gender, job title, and, career stage; stated in Table 2.
<i>Data collection</i>		
17. Interview guide	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	The semi-structured interview guide was developed and tested with two participants (not included in the data set). The interviewers were encouraged to explore issues that arose during the interview that were not addressed by the interview guide. Throughout the data collection phase of the study the guide was dynamic was refined to reflect the important themes emerging in particular participant interviews; stated in text (methods) and appendix 1.
18. Repeat interviews	Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?	N/A
19. Audio/visual recording	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	Interviews were audio recorded; stated in text (methods)
20. Field notes	Were field notes made during and/or after the inter view or focus group?	Interviewers took field notes and wrote memos during the interviews to serve as a secondary data source; stated in text (methods)
21. Duration	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	Interviews lasted a maximum of 60 minutes.
22. Data saturation	Was data saturation discussed?	Yes, interviews were conducted until saturation of themes was met.
23. Transcripts returned	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or correction?	Yes, all participants who were interested had the opportunity to read and comment on their own transcripts.
Domain 3: analysis and findings		
<i>Data analysis</i>		
24. Number of data coders	How many data coders coded the data?	Two analysts coded the data; stated in text (methods)
25. Description of the	Did authors provide a description of the	N/A

coding tree	coding tree?	
26. Derivation of themes	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	Themes were derived from the data. Three qualitative experts conducted the interviews and participated in ongoing memoing during data collection. The codes generated during memoing comprised the initial coding framework.
27. Software	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	NVivo 10
28. Participant checking	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	Yes, all participants received a copy of the final report. They were also invited to an open forum where the results were presented with an opportunity for feedback and Q&A.
<i>Reporting</i>		
29. Quotations presented	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	Yes, participant quotations were used. They were identified by gender and job title.
30. Data and findings consistent	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	Yes
31. Clarity of major themes	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	Yes
32. Clarity of minor themes	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	Yes